DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 895 TM 800 519

AUTHOR Light, H. Wayne
TITLE Light's Retention Scale [and] Recording Form.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 31p.
AVAILABLE FROM Academic Therapy Publications, 20 Commercial Blvd., Novato, CA 94947 (Manual $3.50, 50 Recording Forms $5.00).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education: *Evaluation Criteria: *Measures (Individuals): Psychological Evaluation: *Student Characteristics: *Student Evaluation: *Student Promotion
IDENTIFIERS *Lights Retention Scale

ABSTRACT

Light's Retention Scale, consisting of 19 evaluation categories, is designed for use by teachers and school psychologists to determine whether a student should be retained in grade or promoted. Another suggested use is for nonprofessionals to determine what educational and psychological research discloses about a specific retention candidate in grades Kindergarten through 12. A manual accompanying the recording form discusses the justification for including evaluation scale items such as school attendance, intelligence, present level of academic achievement, physical size, student's age, sex of student, previous retention, history of learning disabilities, motivation to complete school tasks, history of delinquency, emotional problems, etc. Numbers representing the scale-item statement most closely describing the retention candidate are assigned to each statement. The circled numbers are totaled: the subjectively assigned results indicate that a low total sum (zero through nine) suggests retention of a student, whereas a high total sum (72 through 92) suggests that a student should not be retained. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED191895

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

LIGHT'S RETENTION SCALE

H. WAYNE LIGHT, PhD

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
H W. Light

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM 800519 (1 of 2)

JUN 15 80
RECEIVED
ERIC/TM

LIGHT'S RETENTION SCALE

H. WAYNE LIGHT, PhD

Academic Therapy Publications
Novato, California

Copyright © 1977, by H. Wayne Light. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Academic Therapy Publications
20 Commercial Boulevard
Novato, California 94947

Tests, books, and materials
for and about the learning disabled

International Standard Book Number: 0-87879-183-3

0 9 8 7 6 5 4 3
6 5 4 3 2 1 0 9

CONTENTS

Introduction 5
Educational and Psychological Research 6
Description of the Recording Form 10
Administration 20
Scoring 20
Interpretation 20

INTRODUCTION

This manual accompanies the *Light's Retention Scale* Recording Form. It not only presents a step-by-step analysis of the items on the Recording Form, but also offers information on current educational and psychological research. This scale was developed initially as a help to teachers. It is hoped that this scale will be useful not only to teachers, but to counselors, principals, parents, school psychologists, and others involved in the crucial decision of whether a particular student should be retained.

The author would like to emphasize that this scale is never to be used as a "test." It is designed specifically for the school professional to use as a counseling tool during a parent conference or as a means of determining what educational and psychological research would tell us about a specific retention candidate.

Retention is described as not permitting a student to advance to the next grade level with his classmates. Frequent terms for this process are "grade retention," "failing," "flunking," "keeping back," etc.

The minimum requirements established in the development of this scale were as follows:

1. The scale should be as objective as possible.
2. The scale items should be easily comprehended by nonprofessionals.
3. The scale should be capable of utilization as a counseling tool.
4. The scale must be usable at all grade levels (K-12) by individuals who have no formal training in test administration.

Probably the most commonly used criterion to determine retention (and frequently the only criterion) is the student's social maturity. According to research, it becomes apparent that this is only one factor among the many that should be considered. Hopefully, this scale will act as a catalyst for a more global look at a child's functioning.

Light's Retention Scale consists of 19 evaluation categories with a total of 81 possible choices. This scale can typically be administered and scored within a ten- to fifteen-minute period. Administration will permit the professional not only to use one's own judgment in a retention decision but permit a check of that decision against the latest research on grade retention.

EDUCATIONAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH

The concept of the graded school is relatively modern. In 1846, school administrators in Quincy, Massachusetts developed a means of determining how many years students had attended their programs, and for simplicity's sake, designated them as first, second, and third grades.[1] However, today these grade levels are often seen as academic levels rather than years of attendance.

As recently as 20 years ago those children who attended school irregularly or did not achieve academically as well as their classmates were "failed." It was not unusual to find a twelve-year-old child in the second or third grade, depending on the number of times he had been retained. School records also reveal that it was not rare to find fourteen- and fifteen-year-old children in the fourth- and fifth-grade levels.[2]

To retain a child for more than one year is unusual in today's school programs. Occasionally a child will be retained twice, but most educators seem to be restricting retention to one grade throughout the child's school career.

After being retained once or twice, a child may be promoted with others his age level when it becomes apparent that he is unable to learn at the expected rate. This is generally called "social promotion."

The idea of "social promotion" is controversial, to say the least. Karl H. Kumpf states that resistance has grown to any promotional plan which suggests the student did not 'earn' his promotion. Social promotion, total promotion of all students in a given class, continuous progress, and other such plans for grouping children are becoming suspect by some groups who feel that only achievement of grade standards can serve as a sound basis for promotion.[3]

Since 1961, this controversy has not subsided and, in fact, in many areas the term "social promotion" is likened to poor educational management. Mr. Kumpf makes a further comment that those who feel that academic-level achievement should be absolutely required for a pupil to be promoted to the next grade are really dealing with minimal grade standards. He feels this refers to the *least* achievement that will be accepted for promotion. Rigid adherence to this notion "puts undue pressure on children of low ability, and allows the very able to move along with too little effort."[4]

Most people have heard and read accounts wherein the schools are publicly being accused of promoting on a massive basis, with grade retentions being a thing of the past. The research clearly indicates that this is not the case; and, in fact, the practice of "failing" is just as popular now as it was at the turn of the century. For example, within the past years, almost 20 percent of the total school population has been retained one or more years, according to J. N. Ypsilantis and Eleanor H. Bernart.[5] In 1909, a study by Leonard P. Ayres indicated that, at that time, the average rate for nonpromotion of all elementary grades was 16 percent.[6] A study by Hollis L. Caswell, over 40 years ago, revealed that the average rate of nonpromotion in elementary schools had dropped to 10 percent.[7]

Some individuals have complained that the schools are not promoting enough students. These charges that the schools are failing a high percentage of their pupils are not accurate. For example, a California State Department of Education study conducted by Tom Shellhammer produced a statewide study headed by Dr. Max Rafferty, then

California State Superintendent of Schools.[8] It was found that 16.5 percent of the pupils were over the expected age for their grade placement, and more than 80 percent were at expected age, while 2.8 percent were under the expected age. The study also pointed out that the over-age pupils increased at each grade level up to the tenth grade, at which point the percentage of over-age pupils declined for each of the remaining high school years. Over-age boys outnumbered girls by approximately a ratio of three to two, but girls held a slight edge over boys in the percentage of pupils younger than the expected age.

There are many arguments for and against nonpromotion. In general, those who *oppose* retention typically use the following arguments:

1. If children are not promoted universally, the lower grades would "fill up" with slow learners through retention.
2. Nonpromotion adds greatly to the taxpayers' already heavy burden. Some individuals feel that the cost to the taxpayer of having a child repeat a grade is much greater than the gain the child may benefit from it.
3. The best way of classifying children in grade placement is through chronological age. Children tend to achieve better with peers their own age than with younger children or older children.
4. Educational research indicates that children who have "failed" a grade would have learned more if they had been promoted to the next grade level.
5. When a child is "failed," this does not reduce the range of academic achievement in any particular classroom.
6. If the teacher is using a program of individualized instruction, the student's actual achievement should make little or no difference.
7. Classroom homogeneity is not achieved by retention and, in fact, usually creates even greater differences among classmates.

Those who *favor* retention often use the following arguments:

1. The child who is retained will not face the emotional stress of continued embarrassment and is more likely to experience success if he repeats a grade than if he goes on to the next one in his present stage of development.
2. If the child is a slow learner and is placed ahead, he will hold back the rest of the class.
3. Those students who are not able to meet the minimum grade-level requirements should not be placed in the next higher grade. Placement would, of course, represent an even more difficult academic program than the one that they had just failed. The teacher's instruction and the academic material would be beyond the child's comprehension.
4. Every pupil should be at grade level before being promoted. The child's poor performance in the next higher grade will reflect on the teacher who promoted him.
5 Since a child learns responsibility very early, the fact that he must measure up academically should be clear. Placing a child ahead who has not earned this placement will not prepare him for the competitive, demanding life that will usually come during adulthood.
6. The child who is immature needs the year of physical, social, and intellectual maturation.
7. Promoting children who have failed is unfair to those students who have worked hard for their grade promotion.

When one disregards the sometimes emotional arguments for or against retention, it becomes apparent that research studies over the last several decades have consistently shown that retained children *usually* do not improve academically or socially after retention.[9] B. T. McKinney suggested in one of the earlier studies that at least 35 percent of the "failed" pupils did better work by being retained, while 53 percent showed no improvement and 12 percent did poorer work.[10]

Although widely publicized and discussed, the nongraded elementary school, which would practically eliminate the nonpromotion problem, is not frequently seen. Therefore, the problem of failure or nonpromotion continues.

The research can be put to real value and use if observed in an objective manner. There are students who will benefit by grade retention, but those students should not be selected haphazardly or solely on the basis of "immaturity." *Light's Retention Scale* is a means of looking more objectively at a particular student.

The value of this tool during parent conferencing should be recognized. Using this scale when discussing the pros and cons of retention of a particular student will usually establish rapport with the parent, and the attitude on the parent's part that the judgment was based on professional judgment and criteria. This also gives the teacher or school administrator an opportunity to discuss many factors of a child's development and school performance, such as attendance, ability, achievement, physical development, the parent's attitude about retention, behavior problems a child may be having at home or school, and the like.

This scale should not be used as the sole criterion in determining whether or not a child should be retained. It should be used to complement the professional judgment of the educator and uniqueness of each child's situation.

The educator should keep in mind that any time a child appears lethargic, unmotivated, and disinterested, the possibility of physical causes should be investigated. Thyroid deficiencies, lack of sleep, neurological difficulties are just a few physical factors that can sometimes contribute to a child's poor school performance. A complete physical examination, including vision and hearing screening, is always wise.

DESCRIPTION OF THE RECORDING FORM

The 19 categories in the following list discuss in detail the justification for including the scale items. The items were included when research was available for guidance. The numbers that follow each item were assigned subjectively after a careful analysis of research pertaining to the question. In general, the reader can be certain that, when an item is assigned a *0*, the research has shown that this is an asset when a child is retained. When an item is assigned a *5*, this means that the student will almost certainly not be helped by retention and stands a good chance of doing

better by being advanced. Rarely should a pupil with even one *5* on the entire scale be considered for retention.

The following justifications are presented in the same order as will be found on the Recording Form.

1. *School Attendance.* It is obvious that if a child is not attending school or receiving tutoring, he has not been presented with the appropriate learning tasks. This student is, of course, a candidate for retention, as this would give him the opportunity to receive those materials not previously presented. On the other hand, the student who has regular attendance and still does poorly is not a good candidate for retention. This student has already been presented with the material and, for reasons other than his school attendance, is failing.

2. *Intelligence.* If a student is functioning in the lower two percent of intelligence (as measured by standardized test instruments), it is unreasonable to expect him to achieve at an average level academically. This child's ability will probably always be well below that of others his age, and retention will not be beneficial. At the other extreme, a student who is functioning in the upper two percent of intelligence has ability above the average peer of the same age. Assuming there are no learning disabilities or other hindering circumstances, this student can be expected to achieve well above expectancy. A very bright student is not a good retention candidate in that he will be able to "catch up" if the difficulties that are depressing his academic achievement are discovered and corrected.

   A child who is within the general area of ability, usually referred to as "average" or "normal," is the best candidate for retention.

   The child's intelligence level can often be determined by group test scores available in most cumulative records or, more accurately, requesting an individual assessment by a school psychologist.

3. *Present Level of Academic Achievement.* Some children recommended for grade retention are--in

reality—above grade level in academic achievement. The reasons that are often given for this type of recommendation are, that the child "is lazy," "a behavior problem," or "socially immature." Clinical experience and educational research both suggest that the child who is above grade level in academic achievement should rarely, if ever, be considered for retention.

It is important to remember that, if a child is above grade level in most academic areas but behind in one (e.g., above expectancy in reading and spelling but below expectancy in math), he is a poor candidate for retention. If retained, this student may make gains in mathematics, but will not be getting appropriate challenges in the areas of reading and spelling.

A pupil who is *more* than one year behind in academic areas may be a poor candidate for retention. It is unlikely that a child who is two years or more behind academically could catch up in only one year's retention. The best candidate for retention is the child who is approximately one year behind in most academic areas.

4. *Physical Size.* Those working with primary-age children know a child perceives chronological age solely on the basis of physical size. Although size is a relatively superficial factor among adults, this is not true among primary-age children.

   A child who is larger than most others his age will doubly suffer if retained, appearing out of place with children not only physically smaller but chronologically younger.

   The child who is smaller than his chronological aged peers is least likely to be penalized by retention.

   Most school nurses have a pediatric growth curve that will permit an objective comparison of expected heights and weights for various chronological ages.

5. *Student's Age.* When a student's birthdate occurs in the last half of the calendar year (July 1 to

December 1), the pupil is in the younger half of his class and, therefore, is not as likely to be penalized by retention. The child who has a birthdate after December 1 will be in the older half of his class, and this fact should be considered. A child who is more than one year older than his classmates should not be considered for retention.

It is not initially apparent, but the real age concern is not the physical size difference, but the fact that, when students are older than their classmates, the rate of dropping out of school increases enormously. A. H. Livingston studied a large group of eighth and ninth graders who had recently dropped out of school. He found that each of these had experienced retention at least once, and over four-fifths had experienced retention twice; and all were older than their classmates.[11]

H. A. Dillon found that out of a sample of 2000 children who had begun first grade at the same school system, 643 dropped out before completing high school. All but five of these dropouts, 638 (or 99 percent) had been retained in the first grade. Dillon stated that as a combined total, these 643 students failed a total of more than 1800 grades during their first six years of school.[12] J. Hall found that 74 percent of the dropouts in his school system repeated at least one grade as compared to only 18 percent who graduated from high school.[13]

In nearly every case, the researchers felt that one of the prime reasons for the dropout was the significant difference in chronological age and the self-concept that would go with such a situation. For example, E. Godfrey used the *Tennessee Self-Concept Scale* and found that students who repeated grades scored lower than those who had not. Students repeating two or more grades scored far below the mean on each subscale.[14] It is, of course, possible that some of these students had a poor self-concept before entering kindergarten and that retention was not a factor.

6. *Sex of Student*. Specialists in pediatrics and child

development agree that the child's sex plays an important role in both the intellectual and physical development of the child. Most apparent is the difference in the rate of physical growth. Although at birth boys are often slightly larger than girls, it is known that girls will usually catch up and surpass the boys within a few months. Girls usually mature sexually a year or so before boys and are physically larger. The duration of adolescent growth spurts for girls averages three years, for boys five years according to Don C. Dinkmeyer.[15] Because of the girls' faster maturation rate, they are less likely candidates for retention than are boys of the same chronological age. This is especially true at the elementary level.

7. *Siblings.* Even in those families that appear to be free from internal rivalry and competition, this balance is frequently upset when a child is retained and placed in the same grade as a younger sibling. As the grade level widens between siblings, the chances of family difficulties arising seems to lessen. Even when the grade level is two or three years away from a sibling, difficulties sometimes occur after retention.

8. *Previous Retention.* I have observed that, when a child has been retained and does poorly during his retention year, he is often again recommended for retention. Not only does this compound the child's anxiety concerning chronological age and physical size in comparison with his classmates, but it delivers such a devastating blow to the child's self-concept (fears of being a failure) that the chances of his making academic gains are certainly minimal. If the retention is not successful, it seems foolish to try the same method again. Holding a child out of kindergarten is similar to grade retention, although it certainly does not hold the same potential of damaging the child's self-concept.

9. *History of Learning Disabilities.* A student who has a known learning disability is certainly a poor

candidate for retention. Such a student needs intensive, specific remedial efforts aimed at overcoming his difficulty. For example, a child who is unable to hear the subtle differences in sounds (auditory discrimination) will never learn to read in a classroom using a phonetic approach to reading, no matter how often he is retained.

Special techniques that most classroom teachers are unfamiliar with need to be used. Having a disabled child sit through the same grade with little chance of success seems to be without merit.

A child who is not making progress in school for reasons other than a learning disability is a much better candidate for retention.

10. *Student's Attitude about Possible Retention.* It is hoped that the pupil can be included in the decision. A younger child can be encouraged to "be his teacher's helper next year and also catch up on some of the material he missed." An older student will be able to see that this would be an opportunity for him to "catch up." He will be able to start the year at the top of the class instead of the bottom.

Approached tactfully, many children will view retention as a means of breaking the failure cycle. Sometimes a child will request retention because he knows it is what his parents want to hear, although he is very threatened by this thought.

Some children become very attached to a teacher; and, when they request retention, it is really a request to be near their favorite teacher.

Most educators believe that a child should not spend two years with the same teacher unless it is unavoidable. Many students who request retention will feel differently if it is made clear that if they are retained, they will not be permitted to remain with the same teacher the following year.

If a child is threatened by the thought of retention and refuses to discuss its possibility, the chances of his benefiting are minimal.

11. *Parents' School Participation.* Research conducted

by Helen Reinberg and Carol Lee Griffin has shown that there is a relation between parent involvement in the school program and the child's academic success.[16] G. H. J. Pearson felt that it was primarily through identification with and emmulation of the father that a young boy begins to shape future vocational and educational goals.[17] If parents are interested in school and place value on the institution itself and the learning process, most behavioral scientists agree that this is a powerful force. One way to measure this interest is parental-school participation.

Occasionally parents will be so hostile toward the school that they actually encourage the student to fail by giving them the message, "Don't let those teachers push you around!" In this situation, retention will usually not benefit the child.

12. *Motivation to Complete School Tasks.* If a student refuses to perform academic tasks, retention alone will not help. One must first determine why a pupil is refusing to work and then take appropriate steps to increase his interest. If a child is disinterested and hostile, retention will almost certainly increase his hostility.

    If a child is truly unmotivated and disinterested in academic skills, a change to a program using primary reinforcers will often encourage the child to compete. Behavior modification programs offer one means of furnishing primary reinforcers that, when paired with academic tasks, often increases the child's interest in completing school work. This is especially useful when large groups of children from lower socioeconomic neighborhoods are in the same classroom.

    The best candidate for retention is that child who makes a sincere effort to complete his work and shows at least some interest.

13. *History of Delinquency.* Paula J. Caplan discovered that children who are low achieving and also aggressive in the classroom are the ones most likely to be retained.[18] This retention increases a child's

hostility until antisocial behavior becomes evident, not only in school but in the community as well.

Dozens of studies have suggested a strong relationship between delinquency and success in school. As might be expected, a child with a history of delinquency almost always has a history of school retention and failure. These students rarely benefit from retention. S. S. Glueck and E. T. Glueck conducted an impressive study of 500 delinquent boys and a control group of nondelinquents. Their study concluded that there was a high relationship between verbal ability and delinquency. This study also indicates that, among other traits, the delinquent tended to be more adventuresome, aggressive, belligerent, hostile, and resentful than the nondelinquent.[19] Of importance to the educator is the fact that the delinquent tends in greater proportion to come from a home that lacks stability, family cohesiveness, self-respect, good conduct standards, and affection. These studies indicate that retention of an antisocial student is rarely successful.

14. *Knowledge of English Language.* If a child is unable to communicate in English and is not acquiring new language skills, retention will not solve this pupil's dilemma. A bilingual child who is acquiring English but is still having difficutly would be a better candidate.

    Occasionally a child will be found who has poor communication skills in English and is not bilingual. Assuming that this child's nonverbal intelligence is within the average or better range, this child should be evaluated by a speech pathologist. Retention of such a child may or may not be beneficial, depending on other factors.

15. *Present Grade Placement.* Nearly every piece of research on the subject of retention agrees that, in cases where retention has been found beneficial, it is nearly always in a primary grade.[20] Reinberg and Griffin concluded after extensive research that retention is most useful and least apt to have un-

favorable consequences at an early point in a child's school career. From kindergarten to third grade is an ideal time. Reinberg and Griffin feel that an early grade retention is best to give the child a firm footing in basics, and stigma is less attached to retention as much than it would be later in the pupil's career.[21]

As professionals might expect, and Reinberg and Griffin verify, the parental attitudes toward the child's retention experience and learning potential seem to be more negative for second- and third-grade children, compared to first-grade children. Parents of older children in their study had generally been exposed to a longer course of school difficulties and thus tended to be less helpful and positive. It is rare that a child above the fourth grade would do better if retained.

16. *Transiency.* A child's geographical stability is not only a reflection of academic material he has had presented, but is indicative of an unstable family. A student who has attended four to six schools within three years cannot be expected to benefit by retention, as this pattern will likely continue. Such a student has been penalized by the family instability and, if retained on the basis of academic achievement, may never be promoted past the primary level. At the other extreme is the student who is doing poorly for reasons other than transiency and has attended the same school for a number of years. This reflects on the family's geographical stability, and this child has a greater chance of benefiting by retention than a transient child.

17. *Emotional Problems.* A child who is unable to concentrate on the material, is distractible, overactive, and shows symptoms of emotional or neurological problems, will almost never benefit by retention. Simply presenting the same material over with younger classmates will not rid the pupil of his emotional difficulties. A child who functions within the expected behavioral range and has an ade-

quate attention span is obviously the best candidate for retention.

Whenever a student exhibits serious emotional problems, it is the professional's obligation to see that the parents are made aware of resources within the school and community. Most modern school districts have school psychologists and counselors available to assist parents in planning a therapeutic program for the child and family. If approached tactfully, most parents will appreciate this type of guidance.

A teacher should never label a child as emotionally disturbed or mentally retarded. The most constructive way of describing the child is to objectively list observed behaviors.

18. *Experiential Background.* A child coming from a deprived background and having little knowledge of common objects, experiences, verbal expression, and fund of information gathered through his own experience may benefit by being given the opportunity to absorb this material; and retention may be helpful. On the other hand, a student who has many stimulating experiences, such as travel, summer camp, church groups, Scouts, etc. is less likely to benefit from retention.

19. *Immature Behavior.* Probably the most commonly used criterion for elementary school teachers in determining retention is, "The child exhibits immature behavior." This is usually defined as that behavior seen in children of a younger chronological age. One of the more objective means of measuring a child's behavioral and social maturity is to observe the child in a playground situation. A mature child will generally play with those students at his age level, while a child who is socially immature will often seek out the younger, smaller children to spend time with. A child who associates with students older than his actual age usually will find retention a humiliating situation.

Occasionally those students will be found who tend to associate with adults on the play-

ground. Every playground supervisor has had the experience of a child who continually stays nearby and wants to carry on sophisticated conversations. This is usually not an indication of mature social functioning, but rather an indication of emotional problems in that this pupil is unable to communicate and relate with agemates.

ADMINISTRATION

During the development of *Light's Retention Scale*, simplicity was adhered to. It is hoped that this scale can be administered during parent-teacher or parent-counselor conferences. This type of device is an excellent counseling tool, and will frequently clarify the educational and psychological justification for retention. Parents especially need to understand why a specific recommendation is being made concerning their child's school progress. This scale may help in building rapport with a resistant parent by completing the form as a team.

When it appears that a child would not benefit by grade retention but is obviously continuing to have school difficulties, it is important to take constructive steps. Most schools have resources, such as school psychologists, school physicians, or a social worker, who can offer assistance.

The school psychologist will also find the administration of this scale to be useful in counseling with a teacher who insists on retaining a great many students without sound reason.

SCORING

The scoring of *Light's Retention Scale* is simple. Under each item, the individual filling out the form circles the number (*0-5*) behind the appropriate statement. On the Recording Form, these circled numbers are added and a total is derived.

INTERPRETATION

This table is used to interpret the results of the total sum of circled numbers.

An asterisk (*) indicates that, any time a child receives a circled number of *5*, it is likely he will not benefit by retention. The research has justified that, when an item is marked with a *5*, the chances of a child benefiting from retention are very minimal.

The reader must keep in mind that these "scores" are to be used for guideline purposes only. It would be incorrect to view the circled sums as standardized test scores. These results were subjectively assigned after a careful study of the research and field experience.

Total Sum Circled	*Interpretation*
0-9	Excellent retention candidate (should have no *5*'s circled on Recording Form*)
10-20	Good retention candidate (should have no *5*'s circled on Recording Form*)
21-45	Fair retention candidate (should have no *5*'s circled on Recording Form*)
46-53	Marginal retention candidate (should have no *5*'s circled on Recording Form*)
54-71	Poor retention candidate
72-92	Student should not be retained

NOTES

1. Leland E. Glover, *Research Study Series, Research Report Number 2*, Los Angeles County Superentendent of Schools Research Study Series (Los Angeles County Schools printing, Los Angeles, California, January 1965).
2. *Ibid.*
3. Carl H. Kumpf, "Social Promotion a Misnomer?" *National Elementary Principal* 40 (May 1961): 35-37.
4. *Ibid.*
5. J. N. Ypsilantis and Eleanor H. Bernart, "Variation in Age-Grade School Performance," *Teachers College Record* 58 (1957): 268-277. Cited by Constance K. Kamii and David P. Weikart, "Marks, Achievement, and Intelligence of Seventh Graders Who Were Retained (non-promoted) Once in Elementary School," *The Journal of Educational Research* 56:9 (May-June 1963): 452-459.
6. Leonard P. Ayres, *Laggards in Our Schools* (Russell Sage Foundation Publication) (New York: Charities Publication Committee, 1909).
7. Hollis L. Caswell, "Non-Promotion in Elementary Schools," *Field Studies* Number 4 (Nashville: Division of Surveys and Field Studies, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1933): 8.
8. Tom Shellhammer, "Automatic Promotion: Fact or Fantasy," *California Education* 1:7 (March 1964): 25-26.
9. W. A. Coffield, "A Longitudinal Study of the Effects of Non-Promotion of Educational Achievement in the Elementary School," *Dissertation Abstracts* 14 (1974): 2291-2292.
10. B. T. McKinney, "Promotion of Pupils, A Problem of Educational Administration" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana, 1928). Cited in *California Journal of Elementary Education* 21:1 (August 1954): 14.
11. A. H. Livingston, "Key to the Dropout Problem: The Elementary School," *Elementary School Journal* 59 (1959): 267-270.
12. H. A. Dillon, *A Major Educational Problem* (New York: National Child Labor Committee, 1969): 35-40.
13. J. Hall, *A Study of Dropouts* (Miami, Florida: Dade County Public Schools, Department of Research and Information, 1964): 21.
14. E. Godfrey, "The Tragedy of Failure," *North Carolina Education* 2 (October 1971): 10, 11, 29.
15. Don C. Dinkmeyer, *Child Development* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965): 103-104.
16. Helen Reinberg and Carol Lee Griffin, "The Second Time Around," *School Counselor* (1970): 213-218.
17. G. H. J. Pearson, "A Survey of Learning Difficulties in Children," in *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, Volume 7 (New York: International Universities Press, 1952).

18. Paula J. Caplan, "The Role of Classroom Conduct in the Promotion and Retention of Elementary School Children," *The Journal of Experimental Education* 41 (Spring 1973): 8-11.
19. S. S. Glueck and E. T. Glueck, *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1950).
20. Coffield, *op. cit.*
21. Reinberg and Griffin, *op. cit.*

RELATED RESEARCH

"Accelerating the Academically Talented." *NEA Journal* 49 (April 1960): 22-23.

Akridge, G. H. *Pupil Progress Policies and Practices.* New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1937.

Anfinson, R. D. "School Progress and Pupil Adjustment." *Elementary School Journal* 41 (March 1941): 507-514.

Aronow, M. S. "Some Figures on Promotion." *High Points* 35 (December 1953): 5-12.

Arthur, G. "A Study of the Achievement of Sixty Grade 1 Repeaters as Compared with that of Non-Repeaters of the Same Mental Age." *Journal of Experimental Education* 5 (December 1936): 203-205.

Association for Childhood Education International. "The Primary School: Stop! Look! Evaluate!" *Bulletin Number 61.* Washington, D. C.: The Association, 1952.

"Automatic Promotion: Fact or Fantasy?" *California Education* 1 (March 1964): 25-26.

Bergstrom, R. H. "Should Students Fail a Whole Year?" *Ohio Schools* 42 (January 1964): 34-35.

Boyle, B. "Promotion or Retention: Some Recent Research." *Teachers College Journal* 34 (October 1962): 29-30.

Bressler, G. D. "Survey of Business Course Failures at Several Maryland High Schools." *Journal of Business Education* 40 (April 1965): 292-294.

Chansky, N. M. "Progress of Promoted and Repeating Grade 1 Failures." *Journal of Experimental Education* 32 (Spring 1964): 225-237.

Coffield, W. H. and Bloomers, P. "Effects of Non-Promotion on Educational Achievement in the Elementary School." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 47 (April 1956): 235-250.

Cook, W. W. "Grouping and Promotion in the Elementary School," *Series on Individualization of Instruction, Number 2.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1941.

Cook, W. W. "Some Effects of the Maintenance of High Standards of Promotion." *Elementary School Journal* 41 (February 1941): 430-437.

Cotter, K. C. "Explorations and Discourse on School Failures." *Catholic Education Review* 62 (March 1964): 169-182.

Dean, S. E. "Pass or Fail? A Study of Promotion Policy." *Elementary School Journal* 61 (November 1960): 86-90.

Dipasquale, V. C. "Dropouts and the Graded School." *Delta Kappan* 46 (November 1964): 129-133.

Douglass, M. G. "Promotion Policy that Words." *Instructor* 74 (January 1965): 42.

Duncan, J. W. "Motivation and the Academically Troubled Student." *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin* 49 (January 1965): 92-96.

Elsbree, W. S. *Pupil Progress in the Elementary School.* New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1943.

Farley, E. S. "The Influence of Grading and Promotion Poicies Upon Pupil Development." *National Elementary Principal* 16 (July 1937): 268-274.

Farley, E. S. "Regarding Repeaters: Sad Effects of Failure Upon the Child." *Nation's Schools* 18 (October 1936): 37-39.

Gaite, A. J. H. *On The Validity of Non-Promotion as an Educational Procedure* [monograph]. Madison, Wisconsin: Wisconsin University, 1969.

Gibbs, D. N. "Student Failure and Social Maladjustment." *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 43 (February 1965): 580-585.

Gilchrist, Robert S. "Organizing for Maximum Development of Each Individual." *The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals* 46 (May 1962): 274.

Glasser, William. *The Effect of School Failure on the Life of a Child* [monograph]. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1971.

Goodlad, J. I. "To Promote or Not to Promote? Several Answers: Short-Term and Long-Term." In *Toward Effective Grouping.* Washington, D. C.: Association for Childhood Education International, 1962: 34-38.

Goodlad, J. I. "Some Effects of Promotion and Non-Promotion Upon the Social and Personal Adjustment of Children." *Journal of Experimental Education* 22 (1954): 301-328.

Goodlad, J. I. "Research and Theory Regarding Promotion and Non-Promotion." *Elementary School Journal* 53 (November 1952): 150-155.

Goodlad, J. I. and Anderson, Robert H. *The Nongraded Elementary School* (rev. ed.). New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1963.

Gordon, J. B. "Mental Hygiene Aspects of Social Promotion." *Mental Hygiene* 34 (January 1950): 34-43.

Hall, W. F. and Demarest, R. "Effect on Achievement Scores of a Change in Promotional Policy." *Elementary School Journal* 58 (January 1958): 204-207.

Hamacheck, Don E. *Effect of Early School Failure Experiences on Self Image Development and Implications for School Counselors* [monograph]. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1972.

Harris, F. E. *Three Persistent Educational Problems: Grading, Promoting and Reporting to Parents.* Lexington, Kentucky: Bureau of School Services, University of Kentucky, 1953.

Hartzig, B. and Langenbach. "Studies of Three Children Who Have Been Retained a Grade in School." *California Journal of Elementary Education* 21 (August 1952): 51-63.

Heffernan, J. *et al.* "What Research Has to Say About Non-Promotion." *California Journal of Elementary Education* 21 (August 1952): 7-24.

Jones, J. A. "Grading, Marking, and Reporting in the Modern Elementary School." *Educational Forum* 19 (November 1954): 45-54.

Jones, J. J. "Recent Trends in Promotional Theory." *Progressive Education* 33 (January 1956): 5-6, 15.

Kamii, Constance K. and Weikart, David P. "Marks, Achievement, and Intelligence of Seventh Graders Who Were Retained (Nonpromoted) Once in Elementary School." *The Journal of Educational Research* 56:9 (May-June 1963): 452-459.

Kitch, D. E. "Does Retardation Cause Dropouts?" *California Journal of Elementary Education* 21 (August 1952): 25-28.

Klene, B. and Branson, E. P. "Trial Promotion Versus Failure." *Educational Reserach Bulletin* [Los Angeles City Schools] 8 (January 1929): 6-11.

Kowitz, G. T. and Armstrong, C. M. "The Effect of Promotion Policy on Academic Achievement." *Elementary School Journal* 61 (May 1961): 435-443.

Koch, E. L. "Binghamton Evaluates Semiannual Promotion." *American School Board Journal* 148 (May 1964): 28.

Le Baron, W. A. "Some Practical Techniques in Developing a Program of Continuous Progress in the Elemetnary School." *Elementary School Journal* 46 (October 1945): 89-96.

Lennon, R. T. and Mitchell, B. C. "Trends in Age-Grade Relationships: A Thirty-five Year Review." *School and Society* 82 (October 1956): 123-125.

Lobdell, O. "Results of a Nonpromotion Policy in One School District." *Elementary School Journal* 54 (February 1954): 333-337.

Luther, G. H. and Adell, J. C. "A Survey of Current Practices in Large Cities of the United States Relating to Annual and Semi-Annual Promotion, Age of Entry into Kindergarten and First Grade and Promotion Policies." *Bureau of Educational Research, Bulletin Number 52* [mimeographed]. Cleveland, Ohio: Cleveland Public Schools, 1953.

Merced County Schools, *Statement of Belief on Promotion* [mono-

graph]. Merced, California: Merced County Schools Office, 1968.

Miller, N. "Teaching an Emotionally Disturbed, Brain-Injured Child." *The Reading Teacher* 17 (March 1964): 460-465.

Myers, V. C. "The Child Who Fails." *Education* 57 (January 1937): 306-309.

National Education Association, "Pupil Failure and Nonpromotion." *Research Memo Number 2.* Washington, D. C.: Research Division, 1959.

National Education Association. "Pupil Promotion Policies and Rates of Promotion." *Educational Research Service Circular Number 5.* Washington D. C.: The Association, 1958.

Oaks, R. E. "Put Promotion in Its Place." *Childhood Education* 23 (November 1946): 133-136.

O'Neill, J. H. "Who Really Fails?" *Catholic School Journal* 51 (January 1951): 15.

Otto, H. J. "Grading and Promotion Policies." *NEA Journal* 40 (February 1951): 128-129.

Otto, H. J. *Promotion Policies and Practices in Elementary Schools.* Minneapolis, Minnesota: Educational Test Bureau, 1935.

Otto, H. J. and Melby, E. C. "An Attempt to Evaluate the Threat of Failure as a Factor in Achievement." *Elementary School Journal* 35 (April 1935): 588-596.

"Promotion Policies in Our Schools–A Symposium." *NEA Journal* 49 (April 1960): 15-21.

Purkey, William M. *The Self and Academic Achievement* [monograph]. Gainesville, Florida: Florida Educational Research and Development Council, 1967.

Reed, C. H. "Promotions, Automatic or Earned?" *National Parent Teacher* 54 (November 1959): 12-14.

Reynolds, V. J. "School Failures: Let's Let Them Drop Out." *Journal of Secondary Education* 39 (November 1964): 302-303.

Ridgway, R. ". . . And One to Grow On." *Educational Leadership* 17 (February 1960): 313-317.

Russell, D. H. "Influence of Repetition of a Grade and of Regular Promotion on the Attitudes of Parents and Children Toward School." *California Journal of Elementary Education* 21 (August 1952): 29-41.

Sabatino, David A. "Psycho-Educational Study of Selected Behavioral Variables with Children Failing the Elementary Grades." *The Journal of Experimental Education* 38 (1970): 40-47.

Sandin, A. A. *Social and Emotional Adjustment of Regularly Promoted and Non-Promoted Pupils.* New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1944.

Saunders, C. M. *Promotion or Failure for the Elementary School Pupil?* New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1941.

School District of Philadelphia. *School Failure–A Summary of Research Findings* [monograph]. School District of Philadelphia, Department of the Superintendent, 1965.

Schumann, M. G. "Parent Pressure for Promotion: Is This Your Problem Too?" *Minnesota Journal of Education* 38 (March 1958): 33.

Shane, H. G. "The Promotion Policy Dilemma." *NEA Journal* 42 (October 1953): 411-412.

Shane, H. G. "Promotion Practices Follow Sound Psychological Principles." *Nation's Schools* 49 (June 1952): 59-60.

Shrader, J. E. "Can There Be Objective Failure?" *Illinois Education* 50 (March 1962): 293.

Sister Josephina. "Promotion, A Perennial Problem." *Education* 82 (February 1962): 373-376.

Slough, J. E. "What is a Failure?" *Ohio Schools* 40 (April 1962): 19.

Smith, T. "How to Cut College Prep Failures." *School Management* (April 1965): 89-92.

Solheim, A. K. "Shall a Child be Retained in a Grade?" *Minnesota Journal of Education* 41 (March 1961): 34.

Steadman, E. R. "Fifteen Who Were Not Promoted." *Elementary School Journal* 59 (February 1959): 271-276.

Stringer, L. A. "Promotion Policies and Mental Health." *National Elementary Principal* 37 (April 1958): 32-36.

Templin, R. S. "A Check-Up of Non-Promotions." *Journal of Education* 123 (November 1940): 259-260.

Tokareva, E. G. "Three Years Without Repeaters." *Soviet Education* 5 (April 1963): 9-15.

Topp, R. F. "You Cannot Always Do It If You Try." *Elementary School Journal* 52 (December 1953): 230-234.

Vaden, D. "Should Johnny Be Retained?" *Texas Outlook* 48 (April 1964): 371.

Wardenberg, J. "If You Must Fail A Child." *Grade Teacher* 82 (May 1965): 60-61.

Washburne, C. W. "Promotion Versus Non-Promotion." *Proceedings of Schoolmen's Week*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1953: 81-92.

Wentland, C. R. "Individual Differences and School Promotion." *Elementary School Journal* 52 (October 1951): 91-95.

"What Research Says About Non-Promotion." *California Journal of Elementary Education* 21:1 (August 1952): 7-24.

Whetstone, B. D. "Ninth Graders' Perceptions of Their Failures in Academic Subjects." *Vocational Guidance Quarterly* 12 (Summer 1964): 261-264.

White, Kinnard and Howard, James Lee. "Failure to be Promoted and Self-Concept Among Elementary School Children." *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling* 7 (1973): 182-187.

Williams, C. W. "Acceleration: Some Considerations." *Educational Leadership* 18 (March 1961): 351-355.

Wooden, V. C. and Gardner, M. E. "Are Failure Notices Effective?" *Clearing House* 38 (March 1964): 399-400.

Worth, W. H. and Shores, J. H. "On What is Promotion Based?" *National Education Association Research Bulletin* 38 (December 1960): 126.

Worth, W. H. "Promotion or Nonpromotion?" *Educational Administration and Supervision* 46:1 (January 1960): 16-26.

LIGHT'S RETENTION SCALE
Recording Form

Name of Student _____

Date of Birth _____ Present Grade _____

School _____ Teacher _____

Date _____

DIRECTIONS: Read each item and circle the number following that item which best describes the student's situation. Then add the numbers circled. Interpretation of this total score is found in the *Light's Retention Scale* Manual.

---

1. *School Attendance*
   - Student misses more than 25 days of school in nine months 0
   - Student misses 11 to 24 days of school in nine months 2
   - Student misses 3 to 10 days of school in nine months 4
   - Student misses three days of school in nine months 5
2. *Intelligence*
   - Student's intelligence is within the average range of ability 0
   - Student's intelligence is in the lower ten percent 4
   - Student's intelligence is in the upper ten percent 4
   - Student's intelligence is in the lower two percent 5
   - Student's intelligence is in the upper two percent 5
3. *Present Level of Academic Achievement*
   - Student is one year behind grade level in all academic areas 0
   - Student is more than one year behind in all academic areas 3
   - Student is at grade expectancy only in reading but one year behind in other areas 3
   - Student is at or above grade expectancy in reading and spelling 4
   - Student is at or above grade expectancy in all academic areas 5
4. *Physical Size*
   - Student is much smaller than others the same age 0
   - Student is only slightly smaller than most others the same age 2
   - Student is the same physical size as most others the same age 4
   - Student is larger than others the same age 5
5. *Student's Age*
   - Student's birthday falls in the last half of the calendar year (July 1st through December 1st) and is in the younger half of his present class 0
   - Student's birthday falls in the first half of the calendar year and is in the older half of his present class 2
   - Student is one year older than the students in his present class 4
   - Student is more than one year older than the students in his present class 5
6. *Sex of Student*
   - Student is a boy in kindergarten through third grade 0
   - Student is a girl in kindergarten through third grade 2
   - Student is a boy in fourth through twelfth grade 4
   - Student is a girl in fourth through twelfth grade 4
7. *Siblings*
   - Student has no brothers or sisters living in the same household 0
   - Student has a brother or sister more than three grade levels above or below student's present grade level 2
   - Student has a brother or sister two grade levels above or below present grade level 3
   - Student has a brother or sister one grade level above student's present grade 4
   - Student has brother or sister at same grade level or one grade level below student's present grade level 5
8. *Previous Retention*
   - Student has never been retained and started school at the expected age 0
   - Student has been held out of kindergarten and started school one year later than other children his age 3
   - Student has had one or more grade retentions 5

OVER

Subtotal _____

©Copyright 1977, H. Wayne Light. All rights reserved.

Reorder from Academic Therapy Publications, 20 Commercial Boulevard, Novato, CA 94947

TM 800 519 (2 of 2)

Subtotal _____

9. *History of Learning Disabilities*
- Student has been evaluated by a psychologist or other professional and it is clear that there are no learning disabilities 0
- The teacher feels there is no evidence of a learning disability 2
- The teacher feels that the child has a mild learning disability 4
- Student has been evaluated by an educational psychologist and found to have a learning disability 5

10. *Student's Attitude about Possible Retention*
- Student requests retention to "learn what was missed." 0
- Student seems disinterested in whether he should be retained or not 3
- Student requests retention but insists that he get the same teacher next year 3
- Student agrees to retention only after parent persuasion 3
- Student does not want retention but agrees that he is behind in his school work 4
- Student gets upset if the subject of retention is approached 5

11. *Parent's School Participation*
- Parents always attend school conferences and are actively involved in their child's education 0
- Parents usually attend teacher conferences but rarely are involved in other school activities 2
- Parents attend very few teacher conferences 3
- Parents never attend teacher conferences 4
- Parents never attend teacher conferences and are hostile to the overall school program 5

12. *Motivation to Complete School Tasks*
- Student spends at least 80 percent of class time working on school assignments, even though some may be too difficult 0
- Student works on those tasks that interest him 1
- Student is disinterested in school but will work if encouraged 3
- Student is disinterested in school and needs one-to-one help to complete assignments 4
- Student will avoid school related tasks even if offered individual help 5

13. *History of Delinquency*
- Student has no history of antisocial behavior 0
- Student occasionally has difficulty following school rules 2
- Student often has problems on the playground and in the classroom 3
- Student has a history of discipline problems in the classroom, playground and, community, but has not had contact with law enforcement 4
- Student has a history of discipline problems in the classroom, playground, and community, and has had contact with law enforcement 5

14. *Knowledge of English Language*
- Student has good communication skills using the English language 0
- Student has very limited use of the English language but is acquiring new skills quickly 2
- Student is not bilingual and has poor English language skills 3
- Student has little or no knowledge of the English language and is not acquiring new skills 5

15. *Present Grade Placement*
- Student is in kindergarten 0
- Student is in first grade 1
- Student is in second or third grade 2
- Student is in fourth to sixth grade 4
- Student is in seventh to twelfth grade 5

16. *Transiency*
- Student has attended one school since kindergarten 0
- Student has attended two or three schools in the past three years 3
- Student has attended four to six schools in the past six years 4
- Student has attended seven or more schools in the past three years 5

17. *Emotional Problems*
- Student does not exhibit behavior sometimes seen in emotionally disturbed children (i.e., distractible, overactive, nervous, cries often, etc.) 0
- Student exhibits behavior sometimes seen in emotionally disturbed children (i.e., distractible, overactive, nervous, cries often, etc.) 4

18. *Experiential Background*
- Student comes from a background that offers almost no opportunity for social or cultural stimulation 0
- Student has minimal experience with the community and gets little experience in non-school related activities 3
- Student has had many stimulation experiences (i.e., foreign travel, summer camp, church groups, scouts, etc.) 4

19. *Immature Behavior*
- Student associates with children two years or more younger than his actual age 0
- Student associates with children one year younger than his actual age 1
- Student associates with children his age 3
- Student associates with students older than his age 5

Total _____

©Copyright 1977, H. Wayne Light. All rights reserved.